the models nicely and will give the reader a much broader and more accurate understanding of the true costs of non-renewable energy sources.

Our last request is that the energy plan address how to make it as easy as possible for small producers to get their power onto the grid and out to the public. Given that renewables must play a larger and larger role in New Hampshire's energy production plan, we need to remove all obstacles in the way. One of the most pressing issues for small renewables producers is that they are having trouble getting their power on line due to poor interconnection standards. The energy plan will be an ideal venue for outlining specific steps to improve interconnection standards, so that small-scale renewable producers across the state can get their foot in the door of the energy market.

Thanks again for taking our thoughts into account in drafting the 10-year plan. If you need any more information or clarification in formulating the final draft, please don't hesitate to contact us. I look forward to meeting you in person sometime soon.

Sincerely,

Sierra Curtis-McLane

Sierra Curtis-McLane
Environmental Associate

NHPIRG
New Hampshire Public Interest Research Group

80 N. Main St.
Concord, NH 03301
(603) 229-3222 (ph)

nhpirg@pirg.org
www.nhpirg.org
(603) 229-3221(fx)

SEP 0 5 2002

MaryAnn Manoogian
Governor's Office of Energy and Community Services
57 Regional Drive
Concord, NH 03301

Dear MaryAnn:

Once again, thank you for engaging NHPIRG in the formulation of the 10-year energy plan. We were pleased to see that a wind scenario was processed by ENERGY2020; thanks for following up on our suggestion to include it.

In reviewing the different scenarios in the plan, I wanted to address some issues that I believe the text of the plan should examine:

First, I think that it would be beneficial to include in the text of the document a clarification of the GHG emissions prediction in the wind scenario. As I'm sure you noted, no significant drop in GHG was forecast by the computer model.

However, it is important to acknowledge that the addition of 75 MW of wind power to the grid would effectively push back the date by which we need to construct more facilities (due to increased demand). Thus, wind power not only does not contribute to the production of GHGs, but it prevents the production of GHGs from whatever non-renewable source would be constructed in lieu of wind turbines. The double benefit of wind power is not readily apparent from the ENERGY2020 New Wind graph alone, but it could be easily described in a corresponding paragraph.

My second concern is that readers will not be aware of the full environmental costs of the various energy sources based on the modeled GHG emissions predictions alone. Clearly not all environmental costs can be modeled; for example, it would be quite difficult in a twenty year model to accurately portray the long-term costs of nuclear waste transportation and disposal. That is to say, the environmental costs and benefits of different energy sources are far broader than just GHG emissions or reductions.

The 10-year plan should include a discussion of the complete environmental costs of each power source discussed in the proposal. An addendum paragraph describing the environmental and fiscal costs associated with nuclear waste disposal, coal mining, and natural gas drilling (see NHPIRG "Clean Energy Solutions" May 2002) will complement